

TRIBUTE TO RON HINDLE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to deliver a difficult speech. My senior communications adviser, Ron Hindle, is retiring after more than 30 years in the U.S. Senate. If you do some quick math, you will realize that Ron has been part of the Senate longer than I have. I came here in January of 1997 and quickly learned Ron would be an indispensable part of my team. Previously, he had worked for my predecessor, Al Simpson. That meant he knew Wyoming, and he knew how to communicate with Wyomingites.

I am so glad I hired Ron when I came to DC. He has written some of the best speeches I have given over the past 20 years. When Ron told me he was retiring, I went back and looked at a few of his remarks between tears.

When my longtime State director retired, Ron wrote:

There is an old saying we all heard before: Good help is hard to find. Here is my experience: Good help is not only hard to find, it is also impossible to replace.

That was true about Robin, and it is equally true of Ron. In a speech to the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, Ron called the library card "our passport to adventure." For a speech to the Young Entrepreneurs Academy, Ron referred to books, "especially biographies and autobiographies—as 'How To' manuals for success." When I spoke to my grandson's graduating fifth grade class, Ron wrote me an example comparing the Supreme Court to grandparents: "If they say no, there is no one else to turn to."

I hope this sampling of Ron's work can convey why he has been an important part of my team. He has a way with words that few people have and, more importantly, he knows what I want to say and how I want to say it. Ron does more than help me with speeches. If there is a student in Wyoming who has achieved an important goal, Ron helps me with a laudatory note. When an organization like Daughters of the American Revolution has their annual convention, Ron works on the statement commemorating that event. When a Wyoming business celebrates an important anniversary, Ron has helped me congratulate that success.

My staff and I will miss Ron, not only for the help he gives us but for the person he is. He is kind, considerate, and generous. He is also willing to lend a helping hand in everything we do, from hosting our holiday cookie party to organizing trivia, and building games for our staff planning sessions. This isn't goodbye, as Ron will remain my neighbor and my friend.

Today I want to celebrate all that Ron has done for me, for my office, for Wyoming, and for America. It is appropriate for me to once again quote Ron in describing the word "celebrate" to Wyoming Cowboy Challenge Academy graduates, Ron wrote:

Celebrating is much more than the things we do—it's the feelings we get from the great

accomplishments of our life. It is the joy and happiness that comes from the heart when we have reached one of our goals. It's the sense of satisfaction we feel that comes from the knowledge that we have taken on a difficult challenge and mastered it. It is the increase in self-confidence and self-esteem that comes from learning to trust in ourselves to make the right choices and the right decisions.

Ron, Diana joins me in celebrating you today. You have been a great example of the importance of public service, and your legacy will continue in my office and in Wyoming as business owners, students, and others reread the words you wrote over more than 30 years. I thank you for devoting so much of your life to making my office a better place to work and, more importantly, Wyoming a better place to live. Thanks for all you have done for all of us and America. I wish you the best.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there has been a lot of discussion in the media over the last couple of weeks about what President Trump is going to do and should do with the Paris climate agreement. We know all about this agreement. It was entered into by President Obama in December of 2015 at the U.N. annual party that they hold, the 21st annual Conference of Parties meeting.

Let me explain what this is. It was 21 years ago they decided—the United Nations had always been quite offended every time something happened that they were doing in the United Nations that was not in the best interest of the United States. Several of us would call and threaten to withhold some of our funds supporting the United Nations. Of course, the United Nations has always wanted to be independent. They wanted to not be accountable to anyone so consequently they put together these parties. The best way for them to do that is if they could somehow be funded independently and not be accountable to the various countries—not just the United States but any of the rest of them.

So they hold this meeting in December of every year, and they hold it in very exotic places. Everybody gets really excited. They have 192 countries come in. What they are trying to do is get them all to limit their CO₂ emissions. Of course, they all come in because 99 percent of the 192 countries are ones who want to get money out of this deal. I ran into a friend of mine from Benin, West Africa. This was sev-

eral years ago. I said: Why are you here? You are not really going to agree with this stuff. He said: No, this is where the money is. This is the biggest party of the year.

One of the worst things that ever happened at their big party was—they headed to South America someplace, I don't remember where—when they ran out of caviar. They have these big meetings every year.

Well, the last one I went to was December 2009. It was in Copenhagen. You might remember that was just after President Obama was elected. He and his administration were pledging to the 192 countries that we were going to pass a form of cap and trade. Well, they all went to Copenhagen—NANCY PELOSI, Hillary, John Kerry, Barack Obama—they all went there and told them we were going to pass cap and trade here in the United States so they all needed to follow form. This is interesting because of the 192 countries he was talking to, most of them didn't even know our form of government. They didn't know that we had a Senate that had to confirm these things or that we even had a legislature. They assumed that was going to happen.

I remember, right after they left, I went to Copenhagen. I had to go in the morning and get back in time for votes all in 1 day. I did that. At that time, they termed me as the "one-man truth squad." I told them under no circumstances—this is 2009—were we going to pass any kind of cap and trade in this country. I was right. They were shocked over there because they assumed if the President said we are going to do it, that we are going to do it. The legislation was estimated at that time to cost between \$300 and \$400 billion—that is per year—to implement. It never came to a vote because the Democrats knew they had at that time—keep in mind this is 2009—they had control of the White House, they had control of the House and Senate, and they had, at that time, 60 votes in the Senate, but they couldn't get the votes because it was too expensive.

So many people thought it was the first time we would consider cap and trade, but it wasn't. We had been working on that for years. They first tried it in 2003. In 2003, we had a bill for the U.S. Senate. I remember being down here—because at that time I was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Environment and Public Works. They had that jurisdiction. So I was down here to try to make sure that thing wasn't going to pass. Sure enough, it didn't. We defeated it, 43 to 55. Then the same group tried it again in 2005. At that time, they only got 38 votes, and that failed. Then, in 2008, Senators John Kerry and Joe Lieberman tried it again. Of course, at that time, it failed again. Now, that is a far cry from the 60 votes necessary in order to get something like that to pass. We have been looking at that with various forms of legislation for quite a number of years.

After suffering those embarrassing defeats in the Senate, President Obama

sought to do by regulation what he couldn't do through legislation. That is how we got the Clean Power Plan. I think it is important to think back where we got to this point. There has also been an implementation cost, by their own admission, some \$300 billion a year, and it made it impossible at that time for us in the United States to build a new coal-fired powerplant.

It is interesting. Some people say: Why do you go back so often to Oklahoma? I said: Well, I like to talk to real people. I can remember being at Shattuck, OK. I bet the Chair doesn't know where Shattuck is. It is in West-ern Oklahoma.

A guy said: Now, explain this to me. This was actually during the Obama administration.

He said: If we in the United States are dependent upon fossil fuels—that is, coal, oil and gas, and nuclear—to produce 89 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America, and if President Obama is successful in doing away with coal, oil and gas, and nuclear, then how do we run this machine called America?

For that reason, the President decided he was going to do this with regulations.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of all of the regulations—47 of them—we have been able to do away with in the first 100 days be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

A few weeks ago, he signed an Executive order instructing the EPA to unwind the United States from this regulation. That is exactly what my friend, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, is working to accomplish right now.

While the President has disavowed the Paris Agreement, he has not pulled out as of this time. He has been kind of busy doing other things.

I understand there are a lot of competing voices on this front. Many people don't believe the Paris Agreement is binding. While that is true, to a certain degree, it is kind of shortsighted.

I am speaking today because I believe the President should make a clean exit from the Paris Agreement and avoid a lot of confusion. There are two key reasons I want to do that.

The first one, reason No. 1, is that if we remain in the agreement, we are putting ourselves at significant litigation risk.

The Paris Agreement commits the United States to lowering its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent by 2025. This is interesting because in the Paris Agreement that took place, the President at that time, President Obama, was getting just a little bit panicky. He had already gone to seven of these and had been unable to pass any kind of an agreement that would accomplish his goal of putting coal, oil, and gas out of existence. So this agreement that he made, he made unilaterally, saying: I agree on behalf of the United States of America that we will reduce our emissions of CO₂ by between 26 and 28 percent by 2025.

Well, we all know that the environmental community wants to do whatever it possibly can to regulate carbon. There is a reason for this. You might wonder why this is. There is a professor named Richard Lindzen. Richard Lindzen is a professor at MIT and is one of the top professors in this discipline. He said: If you control carbon, you control life.

It makes it a bureaucrat's dream. So yes, in fact, that is what he was trying to do. That is all they want. So if we stay in the Paris Agreement, environmentalist groups—radical groups—would be able to sue the EPA to force it to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under section 115 of the Clean Air Act. Section 115 of the Clean Air Act is entitled "International Air Pollution." This section is triggered when a country asserts that our pollution is harming them, establishing an endangerment finding, and when there is a reciprocal agreement between our countries and those countries that have such a regulation.

It is not difficult to imagine that if we remain in the Paris Agreement, the environmentalists, NGOs, led by the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, and others, will file lawsuits against the EPA as it takes legal steps to deregulate the Clean Power Plan.

While there has not been an internal endangerment finding, the environmentalists would be working to force the issue. Further, they would make the case that the reciprocal requirements of section 115 of the Clean Air Act are met by the Paris climate agreement. Even though it is not binding at the international level, the environmentalists could, with a sympathetic judge, make a case that the administration has made the reciprocal agreement by staying in Paris. It would sound good. It is not too hard to find a sympathetic judge nowadays. This is something they have been planning to do all along. They built this back door into the agreement as the Obama administration was actually writing it.

You ask, why would certain lawsuits be filed? A former general counsel at the Sierra Club, David Bookbinder, said that section 115 of the Clean Air Act is—these are his words—"the silver bullet de jour of the enviros, and they are dead serious about this," meaning that they believe the Paris Agreement clearly states that it meets the reciprocity test established by section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

If you have noticed, the environmental groups have been very silent about whether the administration should stay in the agreement. We all know they want us to stay in the agreement, but why be so quiet at this time? Because we have not heard from them. Well, the reason is, I think the environmental groups who are trying to accomplish this see that there is real progress being made to convince the President to stay in the Paris

Agreement, which means they could have their wish of greenhouse gas regulations. If we stay in the agreement, they could sue the EPA and force regulations under section 115. So they have been very quiet. They don't want President Trump to know they will also benefit if we stay in the agreement. Because of this, they are allowing people to believe that nothing will happen by staying in the agreement. I have heard this from Republicans and Democrats.

It really does not make too much difference, because for ratification, the votes are not there, and everybody knows it. In the meantime, you are subject to the lawsuits. So they just don't want us to know it as well. Could it be that a Republican President would give them the tools they need to force greenhouse gas regulations even without meaning to? It is a possibility. This is why the President needs to make a clean exit from the agreement.

If the President stays in the Paris agreement, he will be putting at risk our ability to accomplish his campaign goals; namely, ending the war on fossil fuels and rescinding the Clean Power Plan. He has already taken the Executive steps he needs on this front. The EPA is currently on solid legal footing. But we must not limit the effectiveness of these key steps by remaining in the Paris Agreement.

So that is reason No. 1. Reason No. 1 is that if we remain in the agreement, we are subjecting ourselves to all of the lawsuits that will be out there.

The other reason, the second reason I will mention, is that even if we pull out of the agreement, we will still have a seat at the table.

I have heard the statement quite often, in fact, by some people in the Trump administration—they say: We don't want to pull out of it because we want to maintain a seat at the table. As they have these meetings every December, we want to be there so we can express what America really is planning to do and is not planning to do.

But let's keep in mind that the seat at the table was established way back in 1992. That was when they had the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the UNFCCC. This is the 1992 treaty that supports all the big parties that meet every December that are held in the exotic locations I mentioned. That group was the foundation of the Paris Agreement and the foundation of the Copenhagen discussion in 2009.

Now, 2009 is when they had the event in Copenhagen. That is the one where all the people went and told them that we were going to pass cap and trade, which we were not going to pass cap and trade, and we didn't. Further, it was the foundation of the Kyoto Protocol of 1997, which was the first agreement that sought to set binding international greenhouse regulations.

The Senate demonstrated its intent to defeat that with the Byrd-Hagel resolution. Let's remember what that was. The Berg-Hagel resolution—by

Senators Byrd and Hagel—was right here in this Chamber. They said they were going to oppose the ratification of any treaty that does one of two things—either it is harmful economically to the United States of America, or that countries that are developing countries, such as China, are not a part of it.

Well, that was the case. So the Kyoto Protocol of 1997 was a natural follow-on from that decision that was made. So even if President Trump removes the United States as a signatory to the Paris Agreement, we will continue to have a seat at the table and the President will have the ability to negotiate further deals. That is already done. That was the done, and it is inescapable. It was done back in 1992. We have been a party to that protocol. We have been ever since then and we will continue to be regardless of whether the President pulls out of the Paris Agreement.

In the event the President does decide to stay in the Paris Agreement, he will need the Senate for ratification because the Paris Agreement meets seven out of eight criteria established by the State Department to determine what constitutes a treaty. An agreement need meet only one of these, and this meets seven. So it would have to come in for ratification. If the President does not exit, the Paris Agreement will be considered as a treaty.

It is in the best interests of the Nation and the President's agenda to make a clean exit from this agreement. That is why we sent a letter, which was sent out this morning by about 25 Members of the Senate, encouraging the President to pull out of the agreement. It is the best way to get everything he wants: a complete end to the war on fossil fuels—which has been ongoing since the day Barack Obama went into power—without the risk of any further future litigation mandating that the EPA establish new greenhouse gas regulations, and a decent seat at the table for the United States, which we all agree that we want. If for some reason he decides not to withdraw, he will have to submit it to the Senate as a treaty, and it would be defeated.

Let me mention two other things which I think are important and which I want to include in the RECORD at this time.

You know, we have been talking about the Paris Agreement. The far left has been trying to get a forum of cap and trade ever since Kyoto in 1997. They have tried to do it through legislation, tried over and over again, as I mentioned. They could not do it, so they tried to do it through regulation.

You might wonder, what was it way back in the beginning—what were the motives for this in the very first place? I carry this. I think it is very important to realize what people were saying about it.

The former Minister of the European Union—her name was Margot

Wallstrom. She said: “Kyoto is about the economy, about leveling the playing field for big business worldwide.”

Then along came Jacques Chirac. He said during a speech at the Hague in November of 2000 that Kyoto represents “the first component of an authentic global governance.”

Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper once dismissed UN's Kyoto Protocol as a “socialist scheme.”

Then Christiana Figueres, who was actually at Paris at the time this thing was put together, said that “the real goal is to change the economic development model for redistribution of wealth among nations.”

Those are some of the original comments people have forgotten about.

The last thing I will mention, because I think it is significant, is that I remember going to Copenhagen. At that time, the person who was the head of the EPA—an appointment by the President at that time—was Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson—actually, we became pretty good friends at that time. She had one problem: She had a hard time saying things that were not true. I asked her a question right before we left. I said: I have a feeling that once I leave town, once I go to Copenhagen, you are going to come up with an endangerment finding.

This was live on the record, by the way, in the committee I was chairing. She kind of smiled, so I knew it was true.

I said: Now, if you come up with an endangerment finding, it has to be based on science. What science would you rely on?

She said: Well, on the IPCC.

That is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Now, I wouldn't say as luck would have it, but it is kind of coincidental that right after she made that statement was when the big scandal that was referred to as “Climategate” came along. They discovered that the scientists who were with IPCC were not getting the results they wanted. So they rigged the science, and they were caught doing it with emails. So there wasn't any question as to what they were trying to do. So that totally diffused the effectiveness and the legitimacy of the IPCC.

In fact, Christopher Booker of the UK Telegraph said: “This is the worst scientific scandal of our generation.”

So when people keep saying that science is settled, that is where it all came from—the IPCC.

Clive Crook of the Financial Times said:

The closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any length to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

Well, I assumed at the time that that would end their providing the science and justification for passing what would have been the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

So, anyway, back to the issue here, several of us feel that to avoid all of

this from happening, the best way to do it is to have this President, when he gets back from his trip, do what he campaigned on and pull out of the Paris Agreement, and I anticipate that he will do that.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS PASSED

SEC Rule requiring oil and gas companies to disclose their “playbooks” on how to win deals. Inhofe-CRA—first signed since 2001; Stream Buffer Zone rule that blocks coal mining; Education rule mandating federal standards for evaluating teacher performance; Education rule establishing national school board; Interior rule that blocked Alaska-control of hunting & fishing; Social Security rule that put seniors with “representative payees” on gun-ban list; OSHA rule that changed paperwork violation statute of limitations from 6-months to 5-years.

Defense rule that blocked contractors from getting deals if suspected (not convicted) of employment-law violations; Labor rule blocking drug-testing of unemployment beneficiaries; BLM rule blocking oil and gas development on federal lands. Federal Communications Commission rule that would have established 2nd regime of privacy rules in addition to Federal Trade Commission; HHS rule that would make it easier for states to fund Planned Parenthood; Department of Labor (DOL) rule forcing private sector employees onto government run retirement plans; DOL rule allowing states to bypass protections on retirement plans.

TRUMP EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Regulatory reform: requires 2 regulations be repealed for each new regulation; WOTUS: directs EPA to rescind Waters of the United States Act; Energy: repeals clean power plan, other harmful regulations . . . ending War on Fossil Fuels; Mexico City: reinstates ban of fed funds going to NGOs that do abortions; Hiring Freeze: freezes federal hiring (exempted military); Military: rebuilds military; Approves Keystone XL pipeline; Approves Dakota Access pipeline.

Permit Streamlining: expedites infrastructure and manufacturing project permits; Immigration: 90 day suspension on visas for visitors from Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen. 20 day suspension of U.S. Refugee Admission Program; Sanctuary Cities: blocks federal Department of Justice grants to sanctuary cities; Dodd-Frank: demands review of Dodd-Frank banking regulations and demanding roll-back; Shrink government: directs federal agencies to reorganize to reduce waste and duplication; Trade: evaluates policies to reduce trade deficit; Opioids: fed task force to address opioid drug crisis; Fiduciary rule: delays implementation of bad DOJ rule; Religious Liberty: Eases enforcement of Johnson Amendment and grants other protections for religious freedom; Offshore drilling: revises Obama-era offshore drilling restrictions and orders a review of limits on drilling locations; National Monuments: Directs a review of national monument designations.

Improves accountability and whistleblower protections for VA employees; Affirms local control of school policies and examines Department of Ed regulations; Reviews agricultural regulations; Reviews use of H-1B visas; Top-to-bottom audit of Executive Branch; Moves Historically Black Colleges and Universities offices from Department of Ed to White House; Obamacare: directs federal agencies to ease burdens of ACA; Establishes American Technology Council; Establishes office of Trade and Manufacturing Policy;

Identifies and reduces tax regulatory burdens; "Hire America, Buy America"; Establishes a collection and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duties and violations of Trade and Customs laws; Creates an order of succession within DOJ; Revokes federal contracting executive orders.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this weekend we will mark the beginning of the Memorial Day remembrances that we do every year. Memorial Day, of course, is on Monday, but many activities will begin even today and tomorrow to honor those who have died in the defense of our country. These men and women had families, they had dreams for the future, and they had their whole lives ahead of them. But they did something extraordinary.

I remember that a few years ago I had the opportunity to be at the American cemetery in Normandy. At the end of the tour of that cemetery, the guide had us sit down on a ledge with the English Channel to our back and those 8,000 graves in front of us that we had just looked at and had talked about the sacrifices made. Then he flipped open his computer and, at that exact same spot, on the 20th anniversary of the D-day, General Eisenhower—former President Eisenhower—in 1964 was talking to Walter Cronkite. He said to Walter Cronkite: You know, Walter, my son John graduated from West Point on D-day, and over the last 20 years, I have watched him and his wife raise their family and have the experiences they have had, and, he said, many times I have thought about these young men and the life they didn't get to lead because of what they were asked to do.

Particularly, you had the person sitting there 20 years later who ultimately was the person who asked them to do what they were asked to do, and you understand that that is the kind of decision he thought about. It is the kind of sacrifice we should think about as we think about those who didn't get to pursue their dreams and didn't get to see the family they had grown up with or have the family they would have liked to have had because they laid down their lives so that we could take care of our families, so that we could realize our dreams, so that we could enjoy the freedoms that our Nation is truly blessed with and that make us truly extraordinary in our belief and our defense of freedom, not only for ourselves but for people everywhere.

We are grateful for all that these people have done, and this is a time of year that we particularly set aside to honor those fallen heroes—the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines, the people in the National Guard and the Coast Guard and the Reserve—called up and losing their lives in that cause.

Also, it is good for us to remember those who served and who were willing to make that sacrifice, if necessary, and often have their own burdens they carry from their service. Maybe that burden was just simply losing those years when others were already at a civilian job that they would only be able to go to later.

I am honored to represent nearly 500,000 Missouri veterans. As a member of the bipartisan Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus, I am committed to helping our veterans find good-paying jobs as civilians. We took an important step in that direction recently when President Trump signed the Honoring Investment in Recruiting and Employing American Military Veterans Act, or the HIRE Vets Act. I believe it may have been the first bill the Senate passed. I was pleased to be the principal sponsor of that bill, and it was the underlying bill on the continuing resolution that funded the government on April 17, and so it became law.

It addresses the fact that transferring from military to civilian life represents a number of challenges. It represents challenges for our servicemembers, and that transfer can be a difficult personal decision to make, but it is also difficult to navigate the civilian employment market and to find out who is recognizing the skills and the lessons learned by veterans and who may not be quite at the forefront of that.

The HIRE Vets Act helps to facilitate that transition by providing veterans more information on employers that offer benefits and opportunities geared toward hiring veterans. Many employers say they are veteran friendly, and many employers are veteran friendly, but there has really been no standard that anyone could look at to determine whether that was true or not—no standard for what employers aspire to do at their workplace or no standard that future veterans and employees can seek out.

This would be much like a LEED standard on energy efficiency. If you have that standard on your building or at your workplace, people know exactly what that means. This bill asks the Department of Labor to establish a similar kind of standard for those who are the best, for those who are nearly as good, and for those who are almost as good as them to see what people are doing—a tiered recognition of employers to see what they are doing to welcome, encourage, recognize, and promote veterans.

Some of the criteria that could go into that evaluation would include the percentage of new hires at your company who are veterans, the percentage of the overall workforce that is made up of veterans, what type of training and leadership activities are made available that are designed to maximize what a veteran uniquely has learned as a veteran, and what other benefits and resources are offered—things such as tuition assistance,

things that encourage veterans to go ahead and get one other category of training or more.

Creating a national standard will help veterans narrow down their employment options and focus their job search efforts on the companies that recognize the value of their military service and what that value will bring to their new workplace, and also companies that will provide a long-term career path where those skills are used and appreciated. So this is a step in the right direction.

I have talked to the Secretary of Labor just this week, who said they intend to have this plan up and running by the end of this year, quicker than they were required to do but certainly not quicker than we hoped they would be able to do. So this is going to be a priority at the office of the Secretary of Labor, as veterans should be a priority for our society.

Today, we have the most powerful military in the world, but we really need to recognize—and I think we do recognize—that behind that military stands supporting families. Families are the backbone of the military today. They provide the kind of support that servicemembers need. They provide the encouragement for the difficult challenges of going from one post to another and one job to another. I think there are ways we can recognize those families and what they do in a better way.

I was able this year again to introduce the Military Family Stability Act. Military families have changed over the years. Our military stays in service longer. The skill levels they acquire are more valuable than might have been the case in the past. As the military gets more technical, having invested the time and training on someone in service is a more significant investment than it may have been at another time. Our policies that affect military families haven't kept pace with our investment in people who are serving.

According to a study by the Military Officers Association of America, 90 percent of military spouses who are women are either unemployed or underemployed. More than half of those people cite concerns about their spouse's service as a deterrent to their prospective employers: having to leave quickly without notice, not getting the ability to transfer from one State to another, or when their training or licensing has happened in the State they were living in.

Too often, military spouses have to end up sacrificing their own career. I think, in any case, we would understand there is some sacrifice here when you are moving from place to place, but there doesn't need to be a needless sacrifice.

So the Military Family Stability Act would allow families to address a problem. I consistently hear from military spouses and people serving in the military who talk about the challenges